

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990)
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549)
Chief, Criminal Division

JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CABN 193425)
Assistant United States Attorneys

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 436-7102
Facsimile: (415) 436-7234
E-mail: julie.arbuckle@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. 3 07 70011 JL
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
v.)	
)	
VERNON WHITE,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

On March 15, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2)(B) from March 15, 2007 to April 10, 2007 for effective preparation of counsel. The parties represented that there is good cause for granting the continuance, and that it was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

1 SO STIPULATED:

3 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
4 United States Attorney

5 DATED: March 16, 2007

/s/
6 JULIE A. ARBUCKLE
Assistant United States Attorney

7 DATED: March 20, 2007

/s/
8 STEVEN KALAR
9 Attorney for Defendant Vernon White

10
11 As the Court found on March 15, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that
12 the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the
13 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the calculations under the
14 Speedy Trial Act, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5.1, and 18 U.S.C. §3142(f)(2)(B) from
15 March 15, 2007 to April 10, 2007 for good cause and the effective preparation of counsel. See
16 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel
17 reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due
18 diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

19
20 SO ORDERED.

21
22 DATED: 03/23/07

